



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,138	04/01/2004	Robert James Salmi	1370.066US1	2503
21186 7590 06/30/2008 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2132				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,138

Applicant(s)

SALMI ET AL.

Examiner

Venkat Perungavoor

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/8/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16-20, 55-58, 60-68 and 70-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16-20, 55-58, 60-68 70-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/8/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues three points with regard to the rejection. The Examiner will address them here.

The first point the Applicant argues is that neither Strassner nor Cooper disclose generating configuration data abstraction layer of routing policy.

Strassner discloses the mapping of level of abstraction and translating of views see Par. 0043.

The second point the Applicant argues that the Strassner fails to disclose the mapping of routing policy abstraction.

Strassner discloses mapping or translating configuration data for routing purposes(e.g. security information, connectivity, protocol information and the like) see Par. 0042.

The third and final point the Applicant argues is that verifying of rules for one or more client protocols is absent in Cooper.

Cooper discloses the verifying of rules including protocols see Fig. 12 item 2014 & 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 6-14, 16-20, 55-58, 60-68, 70-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2004/0230681 to Strassner et al.(Strassner) in view of US Patent Publication 2004/0039942 to Cooper et al.(Cooper).

Regarding Claim 1, 13,19-20, 87-88, Strassner discloses the controller to generate a data abstraction layer of a routing policy, the configuration data abstraction layer to map a routing policy configuration to an intermediate layer comprising fields, operators and arguments see Fig. 4 & Fig. 5 item 504 & Par. 0043 & Par. 0059. But Strassner does not explicitly disclose a policy repository to verify the intermediate layer against a set of verification rules for one or more client protocols including versions thereof, the policy repository to generate complied policy transmission language for use by the one or more client protocols including versions thereof. However, Cooper discloses a policy repository(Fig. 1A item 100) to verify the intermediate layer against a set of verification rules for one or more client protocols including versions thereof(Fig. 2 item 202 & Fig. 14 item 4002), the policy repository to generate complied policy transmission language for use by the one or more client protocols including versions thereof see Fig. 1B item 127 & Par. 0045. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a policy repository for verifying the client protocols in the invention of Strassner in order to monitor traffic and build trust relationships as taught in Cooper see Par. 0043.

Regarding Claim 2, 14, 76, 82, Cooper discloses the generating the complied policy transmission language for use by the one or more clients protocols including versions thereof see Par. 0533 & Par. 0276.

Regarding Claim 3, 79, Cooper discloses the verifying the field-operator pairings in the policy and based on rules associated with dynamic link library(DLL) see Table L Page 20(where the list of fields are checked for compliance).

Regarding Claim 6-7, 77-78, 80, 83-86, Strassner discloses the attach point being a set of capabilities associated versions of client protocols and verifying of protocols see Par. 0070 & Par.0060.

Regarding Claim 8-11, 16-17, Cooper discloses the compiler generates a dynamic link library for each policy see Par. 0116 and optimizing the policies see Par. 0411 & Par. 0390.

Regarding Claim 12, 18, Cooper discloses the using of cached policies for subsequent operations see Fig. 1B & Par. 0043.

Regarding Claim 55, 65, 81, Strassner discloses the generating libraries for attach points associated with one or more versions of one or more client protocols, the libraries to include capabilities for the one or more versions of the one or more client protocols see Fig. 7(where classes are points as classes includes libraries and variables that are accessible for all protocols, i.e. globally accessible) ; and individually checking statements of a routing policy against the capabilities of one or more of the attach points see Fig. 2 item 202 & Fig. 14 item 4002 & Fig. 1B item 127 & Par. 0045. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include verifying the routing policies in the invention of Strassner in order to monitor traffic and build trust relationships as taught in Cooper see Par. 0043.

Regarding Claim 56-58, 66-68, Cooper discloses the verifying the field-operator pairings in the policy and based on rules associated with dynamic link library(DLL) see Table L Page 20(where the list of fields are checked for compliance).

Regarding Claim 60-64, 70-72, Cooper discloses the ignores of action based on the rules and protocols see Fig. 12 item 2004 and further of outputting conditions of outcomes see Fig. 12 item 2011& 2012.

Regarding Claim 73-75, Strassner discloses the generating libraries for attach points associated with one or more versions of one or more client protocols, the libraries to include capabilities for the one or more versions of the one or more client protocols see Fig. 7(where classes are points as classes includes libraries and variables that are accessible for all protocols, i.e. globally accessible) ; and individually checking statements of a routing policy against the capabilities of one or more of the attach points see Fig. 2 item 202 & Fig. 14 item 4002 & Fig. 1B item 127 & Par. 0045. Cooper further discloses the ignores of action based on the rules and protocols see Fig. 12 item 2004 and further of outputting conditions of outcomes see Fig. 12 item 2011& 2012.

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include verifying the routing policies in the invention of Strassner in order to monitor traffic and build trust relationships as taught in Cooper see Par. 0043.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-5, 15, 59, 69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2132

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkat Perungavoor whose telephone number is (571)272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

/V. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2132
June 25, 2008

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132